

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 04-4637**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

versus

HAROLD K. REEDOM,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Columbia. Joseph F. Anderson, Jr., Chief District Judge. (CR-01-861)

---

Submitted: December 9, 2004

Decided: December 14, 2004

---

Before NIEMEYER, WILLIAMS, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

John H. Hare, Assistant Federal Public Defender, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellant. Anne Hunter Young, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Harold K. Reedom appeals from his conviction and sentence following his guilty plea to willful failure to pay a child support obligation in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 228 (2000). Reedom's counsel filed a brief pursuant to Anders v. California, 386 U.S. 738, 744 (1967) stating that there are no meritorious issues for appeal, but asserting that the magistrate judge did not comply with the requirements of Fed. R. Crim. P. 11 at the plea hearing and that the sentence imposed was in violation of the law. Reedom was informed of his right to file a pro se brief, but has not done so.

In accordance with Anders, we have reviewed the entire record in this case and have found no meritorious issues for appeal. We, therefore, affirm Reedom's conviction and sentence. This court requires that counsel inform his client, in writing, of his right to petition the Supreme Court of the United States for further review. If the client requests that a petition be filed, but counsel believes that such a petition would be frivolous, then counsel may move in this court for leave to withdraw from representation. Counsel's motion must state that a copy thereof was served on the client.

We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED